Liebeler, Wesley

King assassination records appeals Harold Weisberg 11/26/79
4/15/75 request, Item 7, information provided to other writers

Over the years during which my timely appeal was not acted on - it has not been acted on yet - I have provided such information, usually with attachments, indicating that contrary to its party line the FBI had a well-established operation for obtaining favorable attention, including in books, and that to this end it provided information and other services to those authors from whom it expected favorable treatment or other political assets. As my uncontested affidavits in C.A. 75-1996 attest, this operation was centered inthe Division of the Orwellian title, "Crime Records," and was under the supervision of then Assistant Director Cartha DeLoach. Recently I informed you that because of untruthful testimony by SA Thomas Wissman on deposition I was forced to begin the compilation of a special file or records indicating these FBI practices and I offered you and your staff access to this file, which now is too large to copy, meaning for me to do the copying. There now is no reasonable doubt that this Division had its own files and that 94 is a file number used for such records. The Department has never searched this file and its counsel refused to have the search made when I requested it, despite not questioning the relevent of the records in it to the case. This has the side benefit for the defendant in compelling me to waste time in preparing more evidence because there has been no compliance with Item 7 of my 4/15/75 request. Deposition testimony established that it is one of three Items of that request relating to which no search has been made after four years.

The newest record I have seen that establishes that the FBI's response in C.A. 75-1996 are false and known to be false to the FBI is part of a series of related records in # 62-109060, Section 102, beginning with Serial 4228 (not attached).

Former Warren Commission staff counsel Wesley J. Liebeler informed the FBI that because he and other former Commission counsel were "troubled" by criticisms such as mine he had decided to do a book in response. One of these other counsel had been and was a Department lawyer who had been loaned to the Commission.

In a 10/19/66 memo to DeLoach the reason given for refusing to provide any help

to Idebeler is not that this is against FBI policy and practice but because the "Bureau could not expect favorable treatment" from him. (It also considered him the most "obnoxious " of the former Commission counsel because he made most requests for information.)

In his letter Idebeler noted that his expected publisher was bringing out a book on the FBI by the Overstreets.

The memo describes this as yet unpublished book as "a book favorable to the Bureau." It then relates that the FBI in fact did help the Overstreets, through then Assistant Director W.C. Sullivan. (He was in charge of "Domestic Intelligence" and was the closest thing the FBI had to an intellectual in residence.)

I have read the Overstreet book. There is no doubt at all that much of their information could have come from the FBI only.

This then is further proof that the FBI did provide information and other assistance to writers, contrary to its present pretense in C.A. 75-1996. The record is also clear that it refused to help writers of whom it was not sure, whose expected work was certain to be in accord with FBI desires - de facto FBI propaganda, as Sullivan himself described it in his recent book.